



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

---

*A Study of the Writings of D. Mariano José de Larra, 1809-1837.*

By ELIZABETH MCGUIRE. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, VII, 2. Pp. 87+130.

This study will serve excellently as an introduction for those beginning acquaintance with Larra. Those familiar with his writings will find in it little that is new. The author attempts a critical estimate of Larra as a writer, backing her judgments with copious quotation from his works. She has obviously been unable to consult certain important sources. Her most original contribution is that section of the work dealing with the French originals of many of Larra's plays. With regard to the question as to which of the three, Larra, Mesonero, or Estébanez Calderón, was first in the field as a *costumbrista*, Miss McGuire appears to accept the judgments of Cánovas del Castillo. This controversy should never have arisen, for Mesonero with *Mis ratos perdidos* clearly was many years in advance of his two rivals in this *genre*. That Mesonero was influenced by Jouy is evident from the most cursory reading of the former's writings. His many allusions to the French author suggest that he had no intent to conceal this indebtedness.

G. T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*F. D'Ovidio e W. Meyer-Lübke, Grammatica storica della lingua e dei dialetti italiani*, tradotta per cura di E. POLCARI. Milano: Hoepli, 1919. Pp. 303. L. 6.50.

Gröber's *Grundriss* has long been appreciated as a work of great value for persons interested in Romanic philology. By translating into Italian the portion dealing with literary Italian and the various dialects of Italy, Polcari has helped in spreading a knowledge of linguistic matters among those who might not otherwise make any use of the *Grundriss*. This second edition differs from the first mainly in regard to the bibliographic notes. It is to be regretted that the text was not carefully revised; what is worth doing is worth doing well. It was reasonable to present the first edition as a simple translation, made from the newly revised German text. But nothing can justify leaving the book almost unchanged, as if Romanic philology had not progressed in the last twelve years. I will mention some details that might be improved.

P. 2: written *j* is said to be unknown initially; but *jeri* is given as a variant of *ieri* on p. 10. P. 3: *j* is said to be named *i longa*. P. 4: Italian is said to admit eye-rimes only where written *e* or *o* is involved; but from

p. 6 we learn that they may also be hidden under the ambiguity of written *s* or *z*. P. 5: if the translator understands *la nasale indeterminata*, he should reveal the secret; otherwise he ought to leave out the remarks about it. It is absurd to speak of *r* as being *gutturale*, *come nel francese e nel tedesco*: French and German students should be warned against using the so-called guttural (velar) *r* in Italian. The use of a dotted or tailed *z*, in teaching Italian to natives, is better than the bare orthography, but *ts* and *dz* should be used in systematic transcriptions. With regard to the sounds, it is unreasonable to say that the occlusive and fricative elements are simultaneous (p. 6). P. 9, bottom: *hj* is a mistake for *kj*. P. 11: *deño* should be changed to *deño*, and *dennji* to *deññi*. P. 13: is there any sound of *j* in *ciò* and *già*? P. 20: two commas, not five, are needed in *e tu, a te, da Roma*. P. 21: in the transcriptions stress should be marked systematically. P. 27: *Skizzen lebender Sprachen* is the name of a series; the title of Panconcelli-Calzia's work is needed (*Italiano nelle S. l. S. del Viëtor*). P. 31: *pio* belongs in § 15, with *pria* and *via*. P. 37: indirect *i* (through *e*) in *ciglio*, *lingua*, *tinca*, is implied by *o* in *moglie* and *tronco*. P. 38: *camicia* is normal, not bookish, early *š* having the same closing effect as *ñ* in the derivative of *tinea*. P. 41: Tuscan stressless *e* is regularly close, so that *nericare* does not explain the change of *nève* to *nève*, *niève*; the latter came from the influence of *lève*, *lieve*. P. 44: contact with a following *j* changed open *i* to close *i*, but did not generally affect close *e*. Dialectal *dito-deta* could have come from inflections of the type *sikko-sikki* (with harmonic closure) beside *sekka-sekke*; in southern Italy there is a widespread change of close *e* to *i*. Otherwise the derivatives of *digitus* indicate the relative chronology of *pera* < *pira* and *\*rejes* < *rēgēs*. Where the *e* of *pera* was developed earlier than the *j* of *\*rejes*, *\*dējeto* kept *é*. Where *j* < *g* was earlier than stressed *e* < *i*, it produced *dito* < *\*dijeto*. P. 45: dissimilation cannot reasonably be assumed for *freddo*. In Hispanic, where *flaccidus* produced *\*ricidus* we find a normal treatment of *frīgidus*; in Italy and France it adopted the stressed vowel of *rigidus*. P. 46: *carena* was borrowed from early Genoese *\*kaṛēna* or *\*kaṛeṇna*. P. 50: the short *e* of *-endo* (beside *-ēre*) was developed by checking, as in *uēntus* < *\*wēntos*, rather than by the influence of *-endo* (*-ēre*). P. 51: the open *e* of *spero* may have come from *spem*. Stressless *\*deet* (afterward re-stressed) was formed from *dēbet* so early that the *e* necessarily became short and open; the re-stressed *è* has replaced historic *é* in *deve*. P. 52: the *i* of *biscia* came from *uīpera*. P. 33: in the derivative of *dirigere*, contact with *j* produced close *i*, which was extended to *diritto*. P. 56: a re-stressing of weak forms explains *bene*, *era*, *sei*; there is no reason for thinking that *sei* came from *sēi*. P. 60: Sicilian *ntinna* and Tuscan *anténna* show that the Latin word had long *e*. P. 61: the influence of *mulier* caused a stress-change in *\*mulière*; the derivatives prove that *i* kept its stress in *\*parīte*. The loss of *pariēs* allowed *parietem* to be treated normally, in accord with *ultra* < *altera*. P. 63: it is absurd to

put *iuncus* under *ū* and then say in a foot note that it had *ŭ*. P. 64: Latin *lucta* had short *u*; the early fronting of *χ* produced close *u* in most of the western derivatives.<sup>1</sup> P. 67: *lupo* is (like French *loup* and Latin *lupus*) a dialectal form. In central and northern Italy, vowel-harmony changed *\*lōpi* or *\*lōbi* to *lupi*, *\*lubi*. "Rimane *u* in iato" is a misleading statement; open *u* has become close. P. 68: I think *unqua* and *-unque* are bookish, beside normal *tronco*, although harmonic changes of stressed vowels are found in some of the Tuscan dialects and may have left traces in literary Italian. Genoese *fonzo* (*funzu*) has analogic *z* from normal *fonzi* < *fungi*; likewise Tuscan *fungo* has borrowed *u* from the derivative of *fungi*. We may assume changes in the following order: (1) *ñ* for the *η* of *fungi*, (2) *ó* for the *ū* of *gula*, *truncus*, *uncia*, (3) *ñ* for the *η* of *\*óηkea* or *\*óηkia*. The *u* of *unghia* probably shows that the *ηγ* of *\*ūηgla* was palatalized enough to modify open *u*; dialectal *onghia* indicates either a lack of such palatalization or a later development (after *\*ūηgla* became *\*óηgla*). Thus *ungo* is analogic, like *fungo*, and dialectal *ongere* is presumably analogic, based on the normal derivative of Latin *ungo*. Latin had *ŭ* in analogic *unctus* and *ū* in normal *\*ūntus* (parallel with *ī* in *quīntus*), so that *unto* may be both analogic and normal. From *pugno* and *vergogna* it is clear that *o* in *gola* was developed earlier than *ññ* from *ndi*, but later than *ññ* from *ηn* (written *gn*). Open *u* was subject to *ñ*-influence, while close *o* was not. P. 69: *fugge* developed normal *ú* from *ù* by contact with *j*. *Perugia* and *Peroscia* belong to different dialects: in one the *o* of *gola* was formed later than *š*, in the other one earlier. P. 70: Sardinian dialects vary between *u*-forms and *o*-forms, in equivalents of the suffix *-occhio*, showing that the Latin *ŭ* was sometimes changed to *ō*. The *o* came from the influence of *oculus*. If the *o* of *\*eskòtere* did not come from *\*estorkere*, we may assume a compromise between *excutere* and *quatere*. P. 72: the *o* of *cognitus* was short. P. 74: the *ō* of Germanic 'knot' is represented in Milanese *næt*, Parmese *næd*, Tuscan *nòdo*. The *u* of *cruna* may have come from Genoese, where *u* < *ō* is normal. In the derivatives of *\*towetos* (and of *\*lowetos*) the loss of *e* produced *ou*, which normally became *ū*; the change of *e* to *o* gave *ō*, with *w* lost between similar vowels as in *uīta* < *\*wīwītā*. P. 75: *oriuolo* was developed through *\*orojōlo*, not *\*horgiolo*; and *ariento* came from a form with a vowel between *r* and *g*. P. 83: it is unreasonable to question *bue* < *\*buoe* after admitting *mio* < *\*mieo*. There is no ground for assuming a long *o* in *\*boe*; the inflection of *bōs*-*\*boe* was modeled on *sūs*-*sue*. The *u* of *spugna* comes from some southern dialect having normal *u* for close *o*, probably Sicilian, the sponge-trade being largely in the hands of Sicilians. Latin *o* before *η* was abnormal: *lungi* developed normally from a variant of *longē* having *u* instead of *o*. P. 89: *Paolo* is bookish; *cavolo* came from Neapolitan. P. 111: there was no general change of *eve* to *ee*; *bee* shows dissimilation, *dee* is a stressless development, and *prete* is connected with French *prêtre* or Latin *praetor*. The *š* of *vescica*

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Review*, XIV, 106.

came from *uezāre*. P. 117: *lj* gives  $\lambda\lambda$ , not simply  $\lambda$ , at least after a stressed vowel.

With regard to morphology little needs to be said. I think the *è* of *ebbe* and *seppe* came from *sette*. The pronoun *mia* is presumably *mē ad* or *mihi ad*, based on *mēcum*. Northern *ghe* could have been constructed from phrases like *i ga < hīc habet*, *i gaveva < hīc habēbat*, parallel with Venetian (*i*) *xe < hīc est*. The reference to Menger's work (p. 168), with nothing but its date and the title in near-English to localize it, would be more useful if the source had been given: *Pub. Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. VIII.

The section dealing with the dialects suffers from the author's failure to represent sounds systematically. Thus we find on p. 175 the Sardinic words *kelu*, *kingere* (meaning *kingere*), and *cunoskere*: these are indexed by the translator as *chelu* and *kelu*, *chingere* (not under *k*), *cunoskere* (why not with *ch* for *k*?), showing that he has misread *kingere* with *ndž* instead of *ng*. Especially unfortunate is the use of *z* for *ts* and for *dz*, with nothing to distinguish the two values. The velar fricative  $\chi$  is sometimes written  $\chi$ ; but *h* is used for  $\chi$  in *ihhala* 'scala' (p. 178), while the silent *h* of *hapu* (p. 176) is written in imitation of literary *ho*. Equally absurd is *laygu* 'largo' (p. 178) for *layyu*, *y* being used elsewhere with the same value as *j*. In a new edition all dialect-forms should be given, if possible, in transcription and in ordinary spelling, as *kingere* (*chinghere*). The reader should learn not only that *ā* comes from *a* combined with *e* in Genoese; he should be told also that *ā* is the author's symbol for open *ē*, and that the *ā* of Genoese spelling means long *a*. A few serious mistakes need correcting, as *šou* (p. 219) for Genoese *šū* (*sciō*) < *flōrem*, *žuven* (p. 218) for Genoese *zuvenu* (*zovenno*) < *iuvuenem*. On p. 103 (and likewise in § 34 of Bertoni's *Italia dialettale*), Milanese is represented as having kept stressed close *o*: Professor Salvioni has kindly informed me that the sound is really *u*.

E. H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

---

*Grammaire élémentaire de l'Ancien Français.* PAR JOSEPH ANGLADE.

Paris: Armand Colin, 1918. Pp. viii+275. 4 fr.

This book is the résumé of an elementary course given during the war and is intended for beginners, some of whom feel discouraged in the start because "les longs ouvrages leur font peur." It consists of three parts: *Phonétique* (pp. 1-74), *Morphologie* (pp. 75-154), *Syntaxe* (pp. 155-269). The chief difficulty in preparing an introductory book on Old French is to know what to eliminate from the vast quantity of material at hand, without, however, eliminating too much. To the author's credit it must be said that he has for the most part overcome this difficulty. The morphology and the syntax are adequately treated, but the phonology, which is the part for